

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

JUN 2 2 2010

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:

SC-6J

<u>CERTIFIED MAIL</u> <u>RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED</u>

John Peters Senior Vice President Total Logistics, Inc. 10717 Adams Street, Suite 200 Holland, Michigan 49423

RE: Complaint and Expedited Settlement Agreement

ESA Docket No. RMP-10-ESA-007 Docket No. CAA-05-2010-0029



2751003A029

Dear Mr. Peters:

Enclosed please find a copy of the fully executed Expedited RMP Settlement Agreement (ESA). The ESA is binding on EPA and Respondent. EPA will take no further action against Respondent for the violations cited in the ESA. The ESA requires no further action on your part.

Please feel free to contact Monika Chrzaszcz at (312) 886-0181, or Chrzaszcz.monika@epa.gov, if you have any questions regarding the enclosed document or if you have any other question about the program. Thank you for your assistance in resolving this matter.

Sincerely,

Mahl

Mark J. Horwitz, Chief

Chemical Emergency

Preparedness & Prevention Section

Enclosure

cc. Stephen M. Alberda (TLC)



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (VE)

REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

2010 JUN 22 AM II: 01

EXPEDITED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT (ESA)

DOCKET NO: RMP-10-ESA-007

This ESA is issued to: Total Logistics, Inc.

At: 42589 Red Arrow Highway, Paw Paw, Michigan 49079

for violating Section 112(r)(7) of the Clean Air Act.

CAA-05-2010-0029

BL# 2751003A029

This Expedited Settlement Agreement (ESA) is being entered into by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 5, by its duly delegated official, the Director, Superfund Division, and by Respondent pursuant to Section 113(a)(3) and (d) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7413(a)(3) and (d), and by 40 C.F.R. § 22.13(b). On February 23, 2009, EPA obtained the concurrence of the U.S. Department of Justice, pursuant to Section 113(d)(1) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. §7413(d)(1), to pursue this administrative enforcement action.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

On September 15, 2009, an authorized representative of the EPA conducted a compliance inspection of the subject facility (Respondent) to determine compliance with the Risk Management Plan (RMP) regulations promulgated at 40 C.F.R. Part 68 under Section 112(r) of the Act. EPA found that the Respondent had violated regulations implementing Section112(r) of the Act by failing to comply with the regulations as noted on the attached RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist (FORM) which is hereby incorporated by reference.

SETTLEMENT

In consideration of Respondent's size of business, its full compliance history, its good faith effort to comply, and other factors as justice may require, and upon consideration of the entire record, the parties enter into this ESA in order to settle the violations, described in the attached FORM, for the total penalty amount of \$1,260.00

This settlement is subject to the following terms and conditions:

The Respondent, by signing below, waives any objections that it may have regarding jurisdiction, neither admits nor denies the specific factual allegations contained herein and in the FORM, and consents to the assessment of the penalty as stated above. Respondent waives its rights to a hearing afforded by Section 113(d)(2)(A) of the Act, 42 U.S.C §7413(d)(2)(A), and to appeal this ESA. Each party to this action shall bear its own costs and fees, if any. Respondent also certifies, subject to civil and criminal penalties for making a false submission to the United States Government, that the Respondent has corrected the violations listed in the attached FORM and has sent a cashier's check or certified check (payable to the "Treasurer, United States of America") in the amount of \$1,260.00 in payment of the full penalty amount to the following address:

> **US Environmental Protection Agency** Fines and Penalties Cincinnati Finance Center PO Box 979077 St. Louis, MO 63197-9000

The DOCKET NUMBER OF THIS ESA must be included on the check. (The DOCKET NUMBER is located at the top left corner of this ESA.)

REGIONAL HEARING CLERK U.S. EPA REGION 5

This original ESA and a copy of the check must be sent by certified mail to: 11:01

Monika Chrzaszcz
Chemical Emergency
Preparedness and Prevention Section (SC-6J)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590

Upon Respondent's submission of the signed original ESA, EPA will take no further civil action against Respondent for the alleged violations of the Act referenced in the FORM. EPA does not waive any other enforcement action for any other violation of the Clean Air Act or any other statute.

If the signed original ESA with an attached copy of the check is not returned to the EPA Region 5 office at the above address in correct form by the Respondent within 45 days of the date of Respondent's receipt of it (90 days if an extension is granted), the proposed ESA is withdrawn, without prejudice to EPA's ability to file an enforcement action for the violations identified herein and in the FORM.

This ESA is binding on the parties signing below.

This ESA is effective upon filing with the Regional Hearing Clerk.

FOR RESPONDENT:	
Signature:	Date: 4, 9, 10
Name (print):John Peters	
Title (print): SR VIK PRE	
Total Logistics, Inc.	
FOR COMPLAINANT:	
Michael Hamus Fa R.K Richard C. Karl, Director Superfund Division	Date: <u>5/27/10</u>
I hereby ratify the ESA and incorporate it herein by reference. It is	is so ORDERED.
Bharat Mathur, Acting Susan Hedman Regional Administrator	Date: <u>6/4//0</u>

CAA-05-2010-0029

INVOICE NO.

RMP10ESA007

DATE

3/31/2010

10717 Adams Street • Suite 200 • Holland, MI 49423 (616) 494-7700 • (800) 333-5599 • FAX (616) 393-2187

Vchr: VCHR00510916

DESCRIPTION

Check Date:

4/1/2010

Check

ITUZBZ Num: 710282

PAID AMOUNT \$1,260.00 DISCOUNT

APPLIED AMOUNT \$1,260.00

CAA-05-2010-0029

BB#275/003/AB29

INTERNAL NO. VENDOR

4590 USE05

US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

\$1,260.00

THIS CHECK HAS VARIOUS SECURITY FEATURES INCLUDING COLORED BACKGROUND, MICROPRINTING & WATERMAR

US BANK Wausau, WI 79-1160/759

DATE

CHECK NUMBER

4/1/2010

710282

TOTAL LOGISTIC CONTROL

One thousand two hundred sixty and 00 / 100 Dollars Only

PAY TO THE ORDER

US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY DOCKET #RMP-10-ESA-007 CINCINNATI FINANCE CENTER

PO BOX 979077 ST LOUIS, MO 63197-9000 **AMOUNT**

\$ 1,260.00

VOID AFTER 90 DAYS

	RECEIVED			
R	MP Program Level 3 Process Facility Name: Total Logistics, Inc.	0W 5	E I I I	
С	hecklist FDA Facility ID. 1000 0005 5724	11:0		
S	ection A – Management [68.15]			2.5
	anagement system developed and implemented as provided in 40 CFR 68.15?	lM	□U	□N/A
На	s the owner or operator:			
1.	Developed a management system to oversee the implementation of the risk management program elements? [68.15(a)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
2.	Assigned a qualified person or position that has the overall responsibility for the development, implementation, and integration of the risk management program elements? [68.15(b)]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
3.	Documented other persons responsible for implementing individual requirements of the risk management program and defined the lines of authority through an organization chart or similar document? [68.15(c)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
Se	ection B: Hazard Assessment [68.20-68.42]			
	zard assessment conducted and documented as provided in 40 CFR 68.20-68.42?	M	□U	□N/A
Ha	zard Assessment: Offsite consequence analysis parameters [68.22]			
1.	Used the following endpoints for offsite consequence analysis for a worst-case scenario: [68.22(a)]	ΣY	□N	□N/A
	For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)]			
	☐ For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)]; or			
	☐ For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)]			
	For flammables: a concentration resulting in a lower flammability limit, as provided in NFPA documents or other generally recognized sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]			
2.	Used the following endpoints for offsite consequence analysis for an alternative release scenario: [68.22(a)]	ΣY	□N	□N/A
	For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)]			
	☐ For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)]			
	☐ For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(ii)]			
	For flammables: a concentration resulting in a lower flammability limit, as provided in NFPA documents or other generally recognized sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]			
3.	Used appropriate wind speeds and stability classes for the release analysis? [68.22(b)]	ΣY	□N	□N/A
4.	Used appropriate ambient temperature and humidity values for the release analysis? [68.22(c)]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
5.	Used appropriate values for the height of the release for the release analysis? [68.22(d)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
6.	Used appropriate surface roughness values for the release analysis? [68.22(e)]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
7.	Do tables and models, used for dispersion analysis of toxic substances, appropriately account for dense or neutrally buoyant gases? [68.22(f)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
8.	Were liquids, other than gases liquefied by refrigeration only, considered to be released at the highest daily maximum temperature, based on data for the previous three years appropriate for a stationary source, or at process temperature, whichever is higher? [68.22(g)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A

		1	35 <u>J</u>	
RMP Program Level 3 Process Fac Checklist EP.	cility Name: <u>Total Logistics, Inc.</u> A Facility ID: <u>1000 0005 5726</u>			
Hazard Assessment: Worst-case release scenario analysis [68.25]				
9. Analyzed and reported in the RMP one worst-case release scenario endpoint resulting from an accidental release of a regulated toxic su conditions? [68.25(a)(2)(i)]	estimated to create the greatest distance to an bstance from covered processes under worst-case	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
 Analyzed and reported in the RMP one worst-case release scenario endpoint resulting from an accidental release of a regulated flammal case conditions? [68.25(a)(2)(ii)] 	estimated to create the greatest distance to an ole substance from covered processes under worst-	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
 Analyzed and reported in the RMP additional worst-case release sce from another covered process at the stationary source potentially aff potentially affected by the worst-case release scenario developed un [68.25(a)(2)(iii)] 	ects public receptors different from those	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
12. Has the owner or operator determined the worst-case release quantity	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
If released from a yessel, the greatest amount held in a single ve that limit the maximum quantity? [68.25(b)(1)]	essel, taking into account administrative controls			
☐ If released from a pipe, the greatest amount held in the pipe, tak the maximum quantity? [68.25(b)(2)]	ing into account administrative controls that limit			
13.a. Has the owner or operator for <u>toxic substances</u> that are <u>normally</u>	gases at ambient temperature and handled as a gas	or liquic	l under	pressure
13.a.(1) Assumed the whole quantity in the vessel or pipe would be release	used as a gas over 10 minutes? [68.25(c)(1)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
13.a.(2) Assumed the release rate to be the total quantity divided by 10, i place? [68.25(c)(1)]	f there are no passive mitigation systems in	ΣY	□N	□N/A
13.b. Has the owner or operator for toxic gases handled as refrigerated	l liquids at ambient pressure:			
13.b.(1) Assumed the substance would be released as a gas in 10 minutes or if the contained pool would have a depth of 1 cm or less? [68.	s, if not contained by passive mitigation systems 25(c)(2)(i)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
13.b.(2) If released substance would be contained by passive mitigation	on systems in a pool with a depth > 1 cm;	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe (as determine instantaneously to form a liquid pool? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]	d per 68.25(b)) would be spilled			
Calculated the volatility rate at the boiling point of the su 68.25(d)? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]	bstance and at the conditions specified in			
13.c. Has the owner or operator for toxic substances that are normally li	quids at ambient temperature:			
13.c.(1) Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe would be spilled insta	ntaneously to form a liquid pool? [68.25(d)(1)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
13.c.(2) Determined the surface area of the pool by assuming that the liqu mitigation system in place that would serve to contain the spill are is in place, was the surface area of the contained liquid used to care	id limit the surface area, or if passive mitigation	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
13.c.(3) Taken into account the actual surface characteristics, if the releas smooth? [68.25(d)(1)(ii)]	e would occur onto a surface that is not paved or	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
13.c.(4) Determined the volatilization rate by accounting for the highest d years, the temperature of the substance in the vessel, and the cond a mixture or solution? [68.25(d)(2)]	aily maximum temperature in the past three centration of the substance if the liquid spilled is	□Y	□N	⊠N/A

er o " o			*
RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Total Logistics, Inc. EPA Facility ID: 1000 0005 5726			
13.c.(5) Determined the rate of release to air from the volatilization rate of the liquid pool? [68.25(d)(3)]	□У	□N	⊠N/.
13.c.(6) Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used provided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features and differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.25(d)(3)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/₄
What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)]			
13.d. Has the owner or operator for <u>flammables</u> :			
13.d.(1) Assumed the quantity in a vessel(s) of flammable gas held as a gas or liquid under pressure or refrigerated gas released to an undiked area vaporizes resulting in a vapor cloud explosion? [68.25(e)]	□У	ΠN	⊠N/A
13.d.(2) For refrigerated gas released to a contained area or liquids released below their atmospheric boiling point, assumed the quantity volatilized in 10 minutes results in a vapor cloud? [68.25(f)]	ΠY	ΠN	⊠N/A
13.d.(3) Assumed a yield factor of 10% of the available energy is released in the explosion for determining the distance to the explosion endpoint, if the model used is based on TNT-equivalent methods? [68.25(e)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A
14. Used the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance to the endpoints? [68.25(g)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□N/A
15. Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used provided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features and differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.25(g)]	ΣΥ	ΠN	□N/A
What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)]			
16. Ensured that the passive mitigation system, if considered, is capable of withstanding the release event triggering the scenario and will still function as intended? [68.25(h)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A
17. Considered also the following factors in selecting the worst-case release scenarios: [68.25(i)]	□Ү	ΠN	⊠N/A
☐ Smaller quantities handled at higher process temperature or pressure? [68.25(i)(1)]			
☐ Proximity to the boundary of the stationary source? [68.25(i)(2)]			
Hazard Assessment: Alternative release scenario analysis [68.28]			
18. Identified and analyzed at least one alternative release scenario for each regulated toxic substance held in a covered process(es) and at least one alternative release scenario to represent all flammable substances held in covered processes? [68.28(a)]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
19. Selected a scenario: [68.28(b)]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
That is more likely to occur than the worst-case release scenario under 68.25? [68.28(b)(1)(i)]	ı		
☐ That will reach an endpoint off-site, unless no such scenario exists? [68.28(b)(1)(ii)]			

					* 11	927
		Program Level 3 Process Klist Facility Name: Total Logistics, Inc. EPA Facility ID: 1000 0005 5726		111		
20.	Co	nsidered release scenarios which included, but are not limited to, the following: [68.28(b)(2)]	D	ďΥ	ΠN	
		Transfer hose releases due to splits or sudden hose uncoupling? [68.28(b)(2)(i)]				
		Process piping releases from failures at flanges, joints, welds, valves and valve seals, and drains or bleeds? [68.28(b)(2)(ii)]				
		Process vessel or pump releases due to cracks, seal failure, or drain, bleed, or plug failure? [68.28(b)(2)(iii)]				
		Vessel overfilling and spill, or overpressurization and venting through relief valves or rupture disks? [68.28(b)(2)(iv)]				
		Shipping container mishandling and breakage or puncturing leading to a spill? [68.28(b)(2)(v)]	-			
21.	Use	ed the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance to the endpoints? [68.28(c)]	IX	ΙΥ	ΠN	□N/A
22.	any app prov	termined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidan other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry a dicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be use vided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features ferences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.28(c)]	s d	ly	ΠN	□N/A
	Wha	at modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)]				
23.	Ens trigg	ured that the passive and active mitigation systems, if considered, are capable of withstanding the release ever gering the scenario and will be functional? [68.28(d)]	it 🗆	Y	□N	⊠N/A
24.	Con	sidered the following factors in selecting the alternative release scenarios: [68.28(e)]	0	Y	□N	⊠N/A
		The five-year accident history provided in 68.42? [68.28(e)(1)]				
		Failure scenarios identified under 68.50? [68.28(e)(2)]				
Haz	ard .	Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Population [68.30]				
25.	Estin poin	mated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the at of release at the center? [68.30(a)]	×	Y	ΠN	□N/A
26.	Iden in th	tified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial building RMP? [68.30(b)]	ngs 🗵	Y	□N	□N/A
27.	Used	d most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)]	X	Y	□N	□N/A
28.	Estir	mated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)]	X.	Y	□N	□N/A
Haz	ard A	Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Environment [68.33]			1	
29.	Ident point	tified environmental receptors that would be included in the distance to the endpoint based on a circle with the t of release at the center? [68.33(a)]	· 🗵	Y	□N	□N/A
30.	Relie envir	ed on information provided on local U.S.G.S. maps, or on any data source containing U.S.G.S. data to identify ronmental receptors? [Source may have used LandView to obtain information] [68.33(b)]	×	Y	□N	□N/A
Haz	ard A	Assessment: Review and update [68.36]				
31.	Revi	ewed and updated the off-site consequence analyses at least once every five years? [68.36(a)]	X	7	□N	□N/A
	or ha	pleted a revised analysis and submit a revised RMP within six months of a change in processes, quantities stoundled, or any other aspect that might reasonably be expected to increase or decrease the distance to the endpoint factor of two or more? [68.36(b)]	red 🗵 Y	7	□N	□N/A

RMF Che	Program Level 3 Process Facility Name: <u>Total Logistics, Included in the EPA Facility ID: 1000 0005 5726</u>	ne.	·		(2)
Hazar	rd Assessment: Documentation [68.39]	ĘĘ.			
us	or worst-case scenarios: a description of the vessel or pipeline and substance selected, assumptions and parased, the rationale for selection, and anticipated effect of the administrative controls and passive mitigation or elease quantity and rate? [68.39(a)]	meters 🗵	ĴΥ	ΠN	□N/A
ra	or alternative release scenarios: a description of the scenarios identified, assumptions and parameters used, that it is attended to the selection of specific scenarios, and anticipated effect of the administrative controls and mitigate release quantity and rate? [68.39(b)]	he X	ÌΥ	□N	□N/A
35. D	Occumentation of estimated quantity released, release rate, and duration of release? [68.39(c)]	×	ÌΥ	□N	□N/A
36. M	fethodology used to determine distance to endpoints? [68.39(d)]	×	Υ	□N	□N/A
37. D	ata used to estimate population and environmental receptors potentially affected? [68.39(e)]	X	İΥ	□N	□N/A
Hazar	d Assessment: Five-year accident history [68.42]				-
Sig	as the owner or operator included all accidental releases from covered processes that resulted in deaths, injurgnificant property damage on site, or known offsite deaths, injuries, evacuations, sheltering in place, property amage, or environmental damage? [68.42(a)]	ries, or	Y	□N	⊠N/A
39. Ha	as the owner or operator reported the following information for each accidental release: [68.42(b)]		Y		⊠N/A
	Date, time, and approximate duration of the release? [68.42(b)(1)]				
	Chemical(s) released? [68.42(b)(2)]				
	Estimated quantity released in pounds and percentage weight in a mixture (toxics)? [68.42(b)(3)]				
	NAICS code for the process? [68.42(b)(4)]				
	The type of release event and its source? [68.42(b)(5)]				
	Weather conditions (if known)? [68.42(b)(6)]				
	On-site impacts? [68.42(b)(7)]				
	Known offsite impacts? [68.42(b)(8)]				
	Initiating event and contributing factors (if known)? [68.42(b)(9)]				
	Whether offsite responders were notified (if known)? [68.42(b)(10)]	ļ			
	Operational or process changes that resulted from investigation of the release? [68.42(b)(11)]				
Section	on C: Prevention Program				
Implem Comme	nented the Program 3 prevention requirements as provided in 40 CFR 68.65 - 68.87?	S 🗵 M		U	□N/A

				W.	7.5	- V
		Program Level 3 Process Facility Name: Total Logistics, Inc. EPA Facility ID: 1000 0005 5726	18.8			
P	reve	ntion Program- Safety information [68.65]				
1.	na pr	as the owner or operator compiled written process safety information, which includes information pertaining to tazards of the regulated substances used or produced by the process, information pertaining to the technology of two cess, and information pertaining to the equipment in the process, before conducting any process hazard analysical quired by the rule? [68.65(a)]	ho III	ľΥ	ΠN	□N/A
	D	oes the process safety information contain the following for hazards of the substances: [68.65(b)]				
		- · · · · ·	ırd			
		Toxicity information? [68.65(b)(1)]				
		Permissible exposure limits? [68.65(b)(2)]	}			
		Physical data? [68.65(b)(3)]	e			
		Reactivity data? [68.65(b)(4)]				
		Corrosivity data? [68.65(b)(5)]				
		Thermal and chemical stability data? [68.65(b)(6)]				
		Hazardous effects of inadvertent mixing of materials that could foreseeably occur? [68.65(b)(7)]				
2.	Ha	s the owner documented information pertaining to technology of the process?	X		ΠN	□N/A
		A block flow diagram or simplified process flow diagram? [68.65(c)(1)(i)]		•		LIV/A
		Process chemistry? [68.65(c)(1)(ii)]				
		Maximum intended inventory? [68.65(c)(1)(iii)]				
		Safe upper and lower limits for such items as temperatures, pressures, flows, or compositions? [68.65(c)(1)(iv)	a			
		An evaluation of the consequences of deviation? [68.65(c)(1)(iv)]				
3.	Do	es the process safety information contain the following for the equipment in the process: [68.65(d)(1)]	⊠ y		□N	□N/A
		Materials of construction? 68.65(d)(1)(i)]		•		mi/V
		Piping and instrumentation diagrams [68.65(d)(1)(ii)]				
		Electrical classification? [68.65(d)(1)(iii)]	- 1			
		Relief system design and design basis? [68.65(d)(1)(iv)]	- [
		Ventilation system design? [68.65(d)(1)(v)]			*	
		Design codes and standards employed? [68.65(d)(1)(vi)]				
		Material and energy balances for processes built after June 21, 1999? [68.65(d)(1)(vii)]				
		Safety systems? [68.65(d)(1)(viii)]				
4.	Has eng	the owner or operator documented that equipment complies with recognized and generally accepted good ineering practices? [68.65(d)(2)]	⊠Y	,	ΠN	□N/A
5.	Has the owner or operator determined and documented that existing equipment, designed and constructed in accordance with codes, standards, or practices that are no longer in general use, is designed, maintained, inspected, tested, and operating in a safe manner? [68.65(d)(3)]				□N	⊠N/A
						

l	10				
		Program Level 3 Process Facility Name: Total Logistics, Inc.			<u>, </u>
	Chec	klist EPA Facility ID: 1000 0005 5726			
l	Preven	tion Program- Process Hazard Analysis [68.67]			
	6. Ha	s the owner or operator performed an initial process hazard analysis (PHA), and has this analysis identified, aluated, and controlled the hazards involved in the process? [68.67(a)]	ΣY	□N	□N/A
	7. Ha	s the owner or operator determined and documented the priority order for conducting PHAs, and was it based on an propriate rationale? [68.67(a)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
	8. Ha	what-if? [68.67(b)(1)] Checklist? [68.67(b)(2)]	ΣY	□N	□N/A
		What-if/Checklist? [68.67(b)(3)] Hazard and Operability Study (HAZOP) [68.67(b)(4)] Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) [68.67(b)(5)] Fault Tree Analysis? [68.67(b)(6)] An appropriate equivalent methodology? [68.67(b)(7)]			
٥	9. Did	the PHA address: The hazards of the process? [68.67(c)(1)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
		Identification of any incident that had a likely potential for catastrophic consequences? [68.67(c)(2)] Engineering and administrative controls applicable to hazards and interrelationships?[68.67(c)(3)] Consequences of failure of engineering and administrative controls? [68.67(c)(4)] Stationary source siting? [68.67(c)(5)]			
		Human factors? [68.67(c)(6)] An evaluation of a range of the possible safety and health effects of failure of controls? [68.67(c)(7)]			
1	0. Wa	s the PHA performed by a team with expertise in engineering and process operations and did the team include ropriate personnel? [68.67(d)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
1	1. Has the owner or operator established a system to promptly address the team's findings and recommendations; assured that the recommendations are resolved in a timely manner and documented; documented what actions are to be taken; completed actions as soon as possible; developed a written schedule of when these actions are to be completed; and communicated the actions to operating, maintenance, and other employees whose work assignments are in the process and who may be affected by the recommendations? [68.67(e)]		ΠY	⊠N	□N/A
1	2. Has that	the PHA been updated and revalidated by a team every five years after the completion of the initial PHA to assure the PHA is consistent with the current process? [68.67(f)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
1.	3. Has	the owner or operator retained PHAs and updates or revalidations for each process covered, as well as the lution of recommendations for the life of the process? [68.67(g)]	ΣY	□N	□N/A
P	reventi	on Program- Operating procedures [68.69]			
14	4. Has	the owner or operator developed and implemented written operating procedures that provide instructions or steps onducting activities associated with each covered process consistent with the safety information? [68.69(a)]	ΣΙΥ	□N	□N/A

						•
	MP Pro	gram Level 3 Process	Facility Name: <u>Total Logistics, Inc.</u> EPA Facility ID: <u>1000 0005 5726</u>	7	73	*))
15	Do the	procedures address the following: [68.69(a)]		ПΩΥ	/KI	I □N/A
	Steps fo	r each operating phase: [68.69(a)(1)]				. 61477
	X	Initial Startup? [68.69(a)(1)(i)]				
	X	Normal operations? [68.69(a)(1)(ii)]				
	X	Temporary operations? [68.69((a)(1)(iii)]				
		Emergency shutdown including the conditions und assignment of shutdown responsibility to qualified in a safe and timely manner? [68.69(a)(1)(iv)]	er which emergency shutdown is required, and the operators to ensure that emergency shutdown is executed	į		
	X	Emergency operations? [68.69(a)(1)(v)]				
	X	Normal shutdown? [68.68(a)(1)(vi)]				
	X	Startup following a turnaround, or after emergency	shutdown? [68.69(a)(1)(vii)]	15		
	<u>Operatir</u>	g limits: [68.69(a)(2)]		1		
	X	Consequences of deviations [68.69(a)(2)(i)]	2.			
	X	Steps required to correct or avoid deviation? [68.69	(a)(2)(ii)]	ti)		ě.
	Safety a	nd health considerations: [68.69(a)(3)]				
	X	Properties of, and physical hazards presented by, the	e chemicals used in the process [68.69(a)(3)(i)]	1		
	X	Precautions necessary to prevent exposure, including personal protective equipment? [68.69(a)(3)(ii)]	ng engineering controls, administrative controls, and			
	X	Control measures to be taken if physical contact or	airborne exposure occurs? [68.69(a)(3)(iii)]			
	X	Quality control for raw materials and control of haz	ardous chemical inventory levels? [68.69(a)(3)(iv)]	×		
	X	Any special or unique hazards? [68.69(a)(3)(v)]		}		
	⊠ <u>Saf</u> e	ty systems and their functions? [68.69(a)(4)]			(4)	
16.	Are oper	ating procedures readily accessible to employees wh	o are involved in a process? [68.69(b)]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
17.	Has the c	wner or operator certified annually that the operating reviewed as often as necessary? [68.69(c)]	g procedures are current and accurate and that procedures	ПΥ	⊠N	□N/A
18.	Has the c	wner or operator developed and implemented safe w perations, such as lockout/tagout? [68.69(d)]	ork practices to provide for the control of hazards during	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
Pre	vention P	rogram - Training [68.71]	9			
19	Has each assigned	employee involved in operating a process, and each process, been initially trained in an overview of the p	employee before being involved in operating a newly process and in the operating procedures? [68.71(a)(1)]	⊠Υ	ΠN	□N/A
20.	Did initia work prac	training include emphasis on safety and health haza tices applicable to the employee's job tasks? [68.71]	ards, emergency operations including shutdown, and safe (a)(1)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
21.	operator r	initial training for those employees already involved nay certify in writing that the employee has the requ and responsibilities as specified in the operating pro	in operating a process on June 21, 1999, an owner or ired knowledge, skills, and abilities to safely carry out cedures [68.71(a)(2)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A

	A 08						
	RMP Program Level 3 Process Facility Name: Total Logistics, Inc. EPA Facility ID: 1000 0005 5726						
22.	Has refresher training been provided at least every three years, or more often if nece in operating a process to assure that the employee understands and adheres to the curprocess? [68.71(b)]	ssary, to each employee involved rrent operating procedures of the	ΠY	⊠N	□N/A		
23,	, Has owner or operator ascertained and documented in record that each employee inv received and understood the training required? [68.71(c)]	olved in operating a process has	□Y	⊠N	□N/A		
24.	. Does the prepared record contain the identity of the employee, the date of the training that the employee understood the training? [68.71(c)]	g, and the means used to verify	ПΥ	⊠N	□N/A		
Pre	evention Program - Mechanical Integrity [68.73]						
25.	. Has the owner or operator established and implemented written procedures to mainta process equipment listed in 68.73(a)? [68.73(b)]	in the on-going integrity of the	⊠Y	ΠN	□N/A		
26.	. Has the owner or operator trained each employee involved in maintaining the on-goin [68.73(c)]	ng integrity of process equipment?	ΧY	□N	□N/A		
27.	Performed inspections and tests on process equipment? [68.73(d)(1)]		⊠Y	□N	□N/A		
28.	Followed recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices for inspection [68.73(d)(2)]	ons and testing procedures?	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A		
29.	Ensured the frequency of inspections and tests of process equipment is consistent wit recommendations, good engineering practices, and prior operating experience? [68.7]	h applicable manufacturers' 3(d)(3)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A		
30.	Documented each inspection and test that had been performed on process equipment, inspection or test, the name of the person who performed the inspection or test, the se the equipment on which the inspection or test was performed, a description of the inspection or test? [68.73(d)(4)]	erial number or other identifier of	⊠Y	□N	□N/A		
31.	Corrected deficiencies in equipment that were outside acceptable limits defined by the before further use or in a safe and timely manner when necessary means were taken to [68.73(e)]	e process safety information o assure safe operation?	□Y	□N	⊠N/A		
32.	Assured that equipment as it was fabricated is suitable for the process application for construction of new plants and equipment? [68.73(f)(1)]	which it will be used in the	□Y	□N	⊠N/A		
33.	Performed appropriate checks and inspections to assure that equipment was installed design specifications and the manufacturer's instructions? [68.73(f)(2)]	properly and consistent with	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A		
34.	Assured that maintenance materials, spare parts and equipment were suitable for the p would be used? [68.73(f)(3)]	process application for which they	⊠Y	□N	□N/A		
Prev	vention Program - Management Of Change [68.75]						
35.	Has the owner or operator established and implemented written procedures to manage technology, equipment, and procedures, and changes to stationary sources that affect a	changes to process chemicals, a covered process? [68.75(a)]	ΧY	□N	□N/A		

			iđ	×	Ø
		Program Level 3 Process Facility Name: Total Logistics, Inc. EPA Facility ID: 1000 0005 5726			
36	. Do	procedures assure that the following considerations are addressed prior to any change: [68.75(b)]	⊠Y		I DN/A
					. 414/2
		Impact of change on safety and health? [68.75(b)(2)]			
		Modifications to operating procedures? [68.75(b)(3)]	·		
		Necessary time period for the change? [68.75(b)(4)]			
		Authorization requirements for the proposed change? [68.75(b)(5)]			
37.	am	ere employees, involved in operating a process and maintenance, and contract employees, whose job tasks would be ected by a change in the process, informed of, and trained in, the change prior to start-up of the process or affected its of the process? [68.75(c)]	⊠Y	ΠN	I □N/A
38.	If a [68	change resulted in a change in the process safety information, was such information updated accordingly?	⊠Y	ΠN	□N/A
39.	If a	change resulted in a change in the operating procedures or practices, had such procedures or practices been lated accordingly? [68.75(e)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
Pre	ven	tion Program - Pre-startup Safety Review [68.77]			
40.	did	the facility installed a new stationary source, or significantly modified an existing source, (as discussed at 68.77(a)) it perform a pre-startup safety review prior to the introduction of a regulated substance to a process to confirm: .77(b)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
		Construction and equipment was in accordance with design specifications? [68.77(b)(1)]			
		Safety, operating, maintenance, and emergency procedures were in place and were adequate? [68.77(b)(2)]			
		For new stationary sources, a process hazard analysis had been performed and recommendations had been resolved or implemented before startup? [68.77(b)(3)]			
		Modified stationary sources meet the requirements contained in management of change? [68.77(b)(3)]			
		Training of each employee involved in operating a process had been completed? [68.77(b)(4)]	•		
Pre	vent	ion Program - Compliance audits [68.79]			
41.	prev	the owner or operator certified that the stationary source has evaluated compliance with the provisions of the vention program at least every three years to verify that the developed procedures and practices are adequate and g followed? [68.79(a)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
42.	Has	the audit been conducted by at least one person knowledgeable in the process? [68.79(b)]	ΣΥ	ΠN	□N/A
43.	Are	the audit findings documented in a report? [68.79(c)]	ΣY	□N	□N/A
14.	Has audi	the owner or operator promptly determined and documented an appropriate response to each of the findings of the t and documented that deficiencies had been corrected? [68.79(d)]	ΠY	⊠N	□N/A
15.	Has	the owner or operator retained the two most recent compliance reports? [68.79(e)]	ΣΥ	ΠN	□N/A
Prev	enti	on Program - Incident investigation [68.81]			
6.	Has catas	the owner or operator investigated each incident that resulted in, or could reasonably have resulted in a strophic release of a regulated substance? [68.81(a)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□N/A
7.	Wer	e all incident investigations initiated not later than 48 hours following the incident? [68.81(b)]	□Y	⊠N	□N/A

_				
	MP Program Level 3 Process hecklist Facility Name: <u>Total Logistics, Inc.</u> EPA Facility ID: 1000 0005 5726			
48	Was an accident investigation team established and did it consist of at least one person knowledgeable in the process involved, including a contract employee if the incident involved work of a contractor, and other persons with appropriate knowledge and experience to thoroughly investigate and analyze the incident? [68.81(c)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
49	Was a report prepared at the conclusion of every investigation? [68.81(d)]	ΣY	□N	
50	Does every report include: [68.81(d)]	⊠Y	□N	
	☐ Date of incident? [68.81(d)(1)]			
	☐ Date investigation began? [68.81(d)(2)]	ļ		
	☐ A description of the incident? [68.81(d)(3)]			
	☐ The factors that contributed to the incident? [68.81(d)(4)]			
	☐ Any recommendations resulting from the investigation? [68.81(d)(5)]			
51.	Has the owner or operator established a system to address and resolve the report findings and recommendations, and are the resolutions and corrective actions documented? [68.81(e)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
52.	Was the report reviewed with all affected personnel whose job tasks are relevant to the incident findings including contract employees where applicable? [68.81(f)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
53.	Has the owner or operator retained incident investigation reports for at least five years? [68.81(g)]	ΣY	ΠN	□N/A
Se	ction D - Employee Participation [68.83]			
1.	Has the owner or operator developed a written plan of action regarding the implementation of the employee participation required by this section? [68.83(a)]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
2.	Has the owner or operator consulted with employees and their representatives on the conduct and development of process hazards analyses and on the development of the other elements of process safety management in chemical accident prevention provisions? [68.83(b)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
3.	Has the owner or operator provided to employees and their representatives access to process hazards analyses and to all other information required to be developed under the chemical accident prevention rule? [68.83(c)]	ΣY	ΠN	□N/A
Se	ction E - Hot Work Permit [68.85]			
1.	Has the owner or operator issued a hot work permit for each hot work operation conducted on or near a covered process? [68.85(a)]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
2.	Does the permit document that the fire prevention and protection requirements in 29CFR 1910.252(a) have been implemented prior to beginning the hot work operations? [68.85(b)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
3.	Does the permit indicate the date(s) authorized for hot work and the object(s) upon which hot work is to be performed? [68.85(b]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
4.	Are the permits being kept on file until completion of the hot work operations? [68.85(b)]	ΣΥ	□N	□N/A
Sec	tion F - Contractors [68.87]			
1.	Has the owner or operator obtained and evaluated information regarding the contract owner or operator's safety performance and programs when selecting a contractor? [68.87(b)(1)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□N/A
2.	Informed contract owner or operator of the known potential fire, explosion, or toxic release hazards related to the contractor's work and the process? [68.87(b)(2)]	ΣΥ	ΠN	□N/A

	T	M E	9.
RMP Program Level 3 Process Checklist Facility Name: Total Logistics, Inc. EPA Facility ID: 1000 0005 5726	- ;		7
3. Explained to the contract owner or operator the applicable provisions of the emergency response or the emergency action program? [68.87(b)(3)]	⊠Y		I DN/A
4. Developed and implemented safe work practices consistent with §68.69(d), to control the entrance, presence, and exit of the contract owner or operator and contract employees in the covered process areas? [68.87(b)(4)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□N/A
5. Periodically evaluated the performance of the contract owner or operator in fulfilling their obligations (as described at 68.87(c)(1) - (c)(5))? [68.87(b)(5)]	ΣY	□N	□N/A
Section G - Emergency Response [68.90 - 68.95]	<u> </u>		
Developed and implemented an emergency response program as provided in 40 CFR 68.90-68.95?	⊠M	□U	□N/A
1. Is the facility designated as a "first responder" in case of an accidental release of regulated substances"	ΣY	□N	□N/A
1.a. If the facility is not a first responder:			
1.a.(1) For stationary sources with any regulated substances held in a process above threshold quantities, is the source included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
1.a.(2) For stationary sources with only regulated flammable substances held in a process above threshold quantities, has the owner or operator coordinated response actions with the local fire department? [68.90(b)(2)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A
1.a.(3) Are appropriate mechanisms in place to notify emergency responders when there is need for a response? [68.90(b)(3)]	□У	□N	⊠N/A
2. An emergency response plan is maintained at the stationary source and contains the following? [68.95(a)(1)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
Procedures for informing the public and local emergency response agencies about accidental releases? [68.95(a)(1)(i)]			
☐ Documentation of proper first-aid and emergency medical treatment necessary to treat accidental human exposures? [68.95(a)(1)(ii)]			
Procedures and measures for emergency response after an accidental release of a regulated substance? [68.95(a)(1)(iii)]	<u> </u> 		
3. The emergency response plan contains procedures for the use of emergency response equipment and for its inspection, testing, and maintenance? [68.95(a)(2)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
4. The emergency response plan requires, and there is documentation of, training for all employees in relevant procedures? [68.95(a)(3)]	□Y	⊠N	□N/A
5. The owner or operator has developed and implemented procedures to review and update, as appropriate, the emergency response plan to reflect changes at the stationary source and ensure that employees are informed of changes? [68.95(a)(4)]	×Υ	□N	□N/A
Did the owner or operator use a written plan that complies with other Federal contingency plan regulations or is consistent with the approach in the National Response Team's Integrated Contingency Plan Guidance ("One Plan")? If so, does the plan include the elements provided in paragraph (a) of 68.95, and also complies with paragraph (c) of 68.95? [68.95(b)]			⊠N/A
7. Has the emergency response plan been coordinated with the community emergency response plan developed under EPCRA? [68.95(c)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□N/A

					•			
		Program Level 3 Process Facility Name: <u>Total Logistics, Inc.</u> klist EPA Facility ID: <u>1000 0005 5726</u>	ر ا	/ / #				
Section H – Risk Management Plan [40 CFR 68.190 – 68.195]								
1.	sub miz	es the single registration form include, for each covered process, the name and CAS number of each regulated stance held above the threshold quantity in the process, the maximum quantity of each regulated substance or sture in the process (in pounds) to two significant digits, the five- or six-digit NAICS code that most closely responds to the process and the Program level of the process? [68.160(b)(7)]	⊠Y	ΠN	□n/a			
2.	Dic	the facility assign the correct program level(s) to its covered process(es)? [68.160(b)(7)]	ΣY	□N	□N/A			
3.	Has Rea	the owner or operator reviewed and updated the RMP and submitted it to EPA [68.190(a)]? uson for update:	XY	□N	□N/A			
		Five-year update. [68.190(b)(1)]						
		Within three years of a newly regulated substance listing. [68.190(b)(2)]	1					
-		At the time a new regulated substance is first present in an already regulated process above threshold quantities. [68.190(b)(3)]						
		At the time a regulated substance is first present in an new process above threshold quantities. [68.190(b)(4)]	E					
		Within six months of a change requiring revised PHA or hazard review. [68.190(b)(5)]						
,		Within six months of a change requiring a revised OCA as provided in 68.36. [68.190(b)(6)]						
		Within six months of a change that alters the Program level that applies to any covered process. [68.190(b)(7)]						
4.	des:	the owner or operator experienced an accidental release that met the five-year accident history reporting criteria (as cribed at 68.42) subsequent to April 9, 2004, did the owner or operator submit the information required at 68.168, 70(j) and 68.175(l) within six months of the release or by the time the RMP was updated as required at 68.190, chever was earlier. [68.195(a)]	ΠY	□N	⊠N/A			
5.	If the	e emergency contact information required at 68.160(b)(6) has changed since June 21, 2004, did the owner or rator submit corrected information within thirty days of the change? [68.195(b)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A			